UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

TRI-STATE DISPOSAL, INC., an Illinois corporation,)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No. 1:18-cv-02138
vs.)	Judge Sara L. Ellis
THE VILLAGE OF RIVERDALE, a municipal corporation;)	
LAWRENCE L. JACKSON, Mayor of the	ĺ	
Village of Riverdale)	
Defendants.)	

EXHIBITS TO TRI-STATE DISPOSAL, INC.'S 56.1 STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL FACTS IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Exhibit FF	Illinois Secretary of State LLC File Detail Report on Centennial Holdings, LLC
Exhibit GG	Declaration of Jeffrey Germany
Exhibit HH	October 10, 2017 Letter from Mayor Jackson to Carmelia Shipp
Exhibit II	November 28, 2017 Village Record of Proceedings Transcript
Exhibit JJ	Riverdale Village Code 2.08.070
Exhibit KK	65 ILCS 5/6-4-1 and 5/6-4-2
Exhibit LL	February 10, 2020 Cease and Desist Notice to Riverdale Materials
Exhibit MM	Declaration of Sheryl Germany
Exhibit NN	Declaration of Mark A. LaRose
Exhibit OO	February 12, 2020 Letter to Daley and Georges regarding threatening phone call
Exhibit PP	Copy of Weeks v. City of Plano, No. 88 C 0518, 1989 WL 20831 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 1989)

EXHIBIT FF



Corporation/LLC Search/Certificate of Good Standing

LLC File Detail Report

File Number	06805337	
riie Number	0000337	
Entity Name	CENTENNIAL HOLDINGS LLC	
Status	ACTIVE	

Entity Information

Principal Office 14501 S. UNION RIVERDALE, IL 608270000

Entity Type LLC

Type of LLC Domestic

Organization/Admission Date Thursday, 15 March 2018

Jurisdiction

IL

Duration PERPETUAL

Name TAMMY WATSON

Address 15059 FOREST VIEW LN SOUTH HOLLAND , IL 60473

Change Date Thursday, 15 March 2018

Annual Report

For Year 2022

Filing Date 00/00/0000

Managers

Name Address LAWRENCE L JACKSON 14501 S. UNION RIVERDALE, IL 60827

Name Address TAMMY WATSON 15059 FORESVIEW LANE SOUTH HOLLAND, IL 60473

Series Name

NOT AUTHORIZED TO ESTABLISH SERIES

Return to Search

File Annual Report

Adopting Assumed Name Articles of Amendment Effecting A Name Change Change of Registered Agent and/or Registered Office

(One Certificate per Transaction)

This information was printed from www.ilsos.gov, the official website of the Illinois Secretary of State's Office.

Mon Feb 21 2022

EXHIBIT GG

DECLARATION UNDER OATH OF JEFFREY GERMANY

I, Jeffrey Germany, being duly sworn on oath and under penalty of perjury, do hereby state as follows:

- 1. I am the Operations Manager and corporate secretary for Tri-State Disposal, Inc.
- 2. The facts contained in this Declaration are based on my personal knowledge, and if called to do so, I could competently testify to these facts.
- 3. I have personally observed Defendant Mayor Jackson and Riverdale Materials' owner Jim Bracken frequently socializing for lunches in south suburban Midlothian. I have personally seen them there several times, and have personal knowledge that they frequently have lunch (approximately once per week in Midlothian).
- 4. As I testified in my deposition, prior to September and October of 2017, Tri-State was regularly paid by the Village in 30-45 days (the contract with Riverdale says 15 days). Tri-State was okay with that. However, almost immediately after Tri-State issued criticism regarding the Riverdale Materials' site, the procedures, the contamination, the run-off, the fact that Riverdale didn't own the retention pond, that there should be both post-closure bonds and royalties required of Riverdale Materials, payments went from being received in 30-45 days to 180 days and more. Because of this Tri-State had to scramble to pay all of its bills, including payrolls, expenses, loan payments, utilities, property taxes, which never stopped during this period, and payment of these bills was hampered, if not completely interrupted, by the lack of payments from Riverdale. The Village still owes Tri-State some interest on the late payments.
- 5. Also, even though Tri-State had the right to terminate essential trash pick-up services and to not pay royalties due to Riverdale's lack of payment, Tri-State continued to provide its usual and essential services to the Village residents and continued to pay royalties to the Village.
- 6. In addition, Tri-State suffered damages to its reputation by not being allowed to participate in the 2018 Spring Clean-up. Residents called us for advice on when the clean-up will happen, and because of the Village's action (inaction) we could not provide them with any information, which made us look totally incompetent.

- 7. Tri-State's other damages include the loss of the opportunity to bid on the garbage contract. Also, Tri-State lost contracts that it had with multi-family building owners when the Mayor approved requiring these owners to use Flood Bros. as its sole garbage contractor.
- 8. The Village contract that Tri-State was not given an opportunity to bid on, was worth approximately \$60,000 to \$65,000 per month, and Tri-State expected it to continue for at least five (5) years.
- 9. Tri-State lost contracts that it had with multi-family building owners when the Mayor approved requiring these owners to use Flood Bros. as its sole garbage contractor. In addition, Tri-State earned approximately \$6,000 per month on the multi-family contract, or approximately \$72,000 a year. Tri-State expected the multi-family contract to go on indefinitely, but because of the ordinance the Mayor approved requiring multi-family owners to use Flood Bros. as its sole garbage contractor, Tri-State lost that approximate \$72,000 per year.

Further Declarant Sayeth Not.

EXHIBIT HH



VILLAGE OF RIVERDALE

157 WEST 144[™] STREET, RIVERDALE, IL 60827 PHONE (708) 841-2200 • FAX (708) 841-7587

Lawrence L. Jackson

10/10/17

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Carmelia Shipp 14211 S. Parnell Riverdale, Illinois 60827

Re: Termination of Limited/Term Appointment

Dear Ms. Shipp,

This letter is to inform you that your appointment as a Zoning Board of Appeals Commissioner has ended and will not be renewed.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your contribution to the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Village of Riverdale.

I wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

Lawrence L. Jackson

Mayor

EXHIBIT II

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS = 11/28/2017

```
1
     TRI-STATE DISPOSAL, INC.,
 2
                       Complainant,
 3
 4
     vs.
     RIVERDALE MATERIALS, LLC,
 5
                       Respondent.
 6
 7
                       Record of proceedings in the
 8
     hearing of the above-entitled cause, at 157 W. 144th
     Street, before the Board of Trustees of the Village
10
     of Riverdale, in the City of Riverdale, County of
11
     Cook, State of Illinois, before Victoria D. Rocks,
12
     CSR, Notary Public, commencing at 7:00 o'clock p.m.,
13
     on the 28th day of November, 2017, A.D.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

```
Page 7
                                                 Page 6
                                                               public now have an opportunity to address the Board.
     comment is at the conclusion.
                                                               You'll be allowed to speak once for three minutes.
         MR. LaROSE: Not the document that I delivered
                                                           2
2
                                                               When you're recognized by the Chair, please state
    at 2:00 o'clock today. It's outside the record.
                                                           3
3
                                                               your name for the record. Mr. LaRose.
         MR. WELCH: Please sit down. You'll have your
                                                           5
                                                                    MR. LaROSE: Thank you, Mayor. Mr. Mayor,
    chance during public comment.
5
                                                               members of the Board, Officers, my name is Mark
         MR. LEWIS: I second.
6
                                                               LaRose, principal of the law firm of LaRose Bosco.
7
         MR. JACKSON: Roll call, please.
8
         MS. HOLCOMB: Trustee Lewis.
                                                           R
                                                                         I represent Tri-State Disposal, the folks
                                                               that run a transfer station in town for going on 20
                                                           9
         MR. LEWIS: Here.
                                                               years. They pick up your trash. Supply more than a
                                                           10
         MR. WELCH: You have to say yes.
10
                                                               million dollars of royalties to the Village, and
11
         MR. LEWIS: Yes.
                                                           11
                                                               they have posted a $50,000 CD for the benefit of
12
         MS. HOLCOMB: Trustee Lewis.
                                                           12
                                                           13
                                                               Riverdale in case anything goes wrong at the site.
13
         MR. LEWIS: Yes.
                                                               An 18 year perfect operating history.
         MS. HOLCOMB: Trustee Smith.
                                                           14
14
                                                                       Today I delivered or my assistant delivered
                                                           15
15
         MR. SMITH: Yes.
                                                               to Linda Alexander at 2:00 o'clock a package for
                                                           16
16
         MS. HOLCOMB: Trustee Jefferson.
                                                           17
                                                                each of you with respect to the transfer station
17
         MR. JEFFERSON: Yes.
                                                                ordinance that you just passed.
18
         MS. HOLCOMB: Trustee Riley-Pinkney.
                                                           18
                                                           19
                                                                       I would like to ask that this be made part of
         MS. RILEY-PINKNEY: Yes.
19
                                                               the record for this hearing.
         MS. HOLCOMB: Trustee Williams.
                                                           20
20
                                                                    MR. WELCH: The hearing is closed. This is not
21
         MS. WILLIAMS: Yes.
                                                           21
                                                               a hearing, this is a meeting. And Mr. LaRose, as an
         MS. HOLCOMB: And Trustee Levere.
                                                           22
22
                                                                attorney, you should be aware that there are other
         MR. LEVERE: Yes.
                                                           23
23
                                                               parties that have an interest in this application
          MR. JACKSON: Motion passed. Members of the
24
                                                                                                            Page 9
                                                  Page 8
                                                                       The Zoning Board is the one who controlled
 1 and to submit something without discussion and
                                                           1
    without them having the ability to submit additional
                                                               the record.
     evidence to refute what you're proposing to submit,
                                                            4
                                                                     MR. LaROSE: Except, Mr. Welch, as an attorney
                                                               you should know that the actions of this Board today
    it causes problems as it relates to those people's
                                                               are subject to review by the Circuit Court of Cook
 5
    rights.
           Everyone had an opportunity to submit
                                                            6
 6
    documentation and evidence into the record. It's
                                                            7
                                                                       So this is a hearing, and this is a
                                                            8
                                                                decision --
     now closed.
                                                                     MR. WELCH: Respectfully, you're wrong. Here
 9
          MR. LaROSE: Except, Mr. Welch, it would have
                                                           9
                                                               is why. Let me explain. This is subject to de novo
10 been impossible at the hearing to submit a
                                                           10
     transcript of the hearing.
                                                           11
                                                               review
11
                                                                         Do you understand what de novo review is?
            It would have been impossible at the hearing
                                                           12
12
     to submit the results of an FOIA request that I had
                                                           13
                                                                     MR. LaROSE: Yes. It means new. I took Latin
13
                                                               in law school too.
     to make after the hearing. So these are things that
                                                           14
                                                                     MR. WELCH: This is considered a legislative
     some of which were in there before, but new stuff.
                                                           15
15
                                                                action subject to de novo review. So in the event
16 And I think you should accept it.
                                                           16
                                                               that you have issues and want to take it to the
                                                           17
           But if you don't, I want a ruling on the
17
                                                                Circuit Court, we're going to create our own record.
18 record so the Court --
                                                           18
                                                                    MR. LaROSE: Yes.
19
          MR. WELCH: It's not a hearing.
                                                           19
          MR. LaROSE: I am asking for this to be part of
                                                           20
                                                                    MR. WELCH: All right.
20
                                                                     MR. LaROSE: I would like this to be part of
                                                           21
21 the record.
                                                                the record that you are creating.
         MR. WELCH: This Board is not here to make a
                                                           22
                                                                    MR. WELCH: That is created in the Circuit
23
   ruling. There is no ruling. They are not the
                                                           23
    Zoning Board.
                                                                Court. The Zoning Board record is closed.
```

24

```
Page 11
                                                Page 10
         MR. LaROSE: Okay, but the Zoning Board action
                                                                      You can't ask for a better business person to
2 is also subject to review under the administrative
                                                               come into your community. I know that there may
                                                           2
                                                               have been some concerns, some questions that have
   review law
 4
         MR. WELCH: Incorrect.
                                                               been raised. We were at the meetings prior and had
                                                           5
                                                               heard the concerns that have been addressed.
         MR. JACKSON: Your time is expired.
5
                                                                      I just wanted to express a positive light on
         MR. LaROSE: Half it of it has been taken up by
 6
                                                               the new business coming into this community. And
    the lawyer. I would like somebody to tell me--
                                                           7
         MR. JACKSON: Your time is expired. Does
                                                           8
                                                               the participation with minority companies throughout
8
                                                               Cook County has been very impressive based on my
9
    anyone wish to address the Board?
                                                           9
                                                               interaction with the company over the years. So I
10
         MR. WELCH: You could submit it as a resident
                                                          10
                                                               appreciate your time.
11 or a citizen, whatever you like. You could submit
                                                          11
    it, but it's not going to be made part of the Zoning
                                                                    MR. JACKSON: Thank you for your comments.
    Board record.
                                                          13
                                                               Mr. Reynolds.
13
                                                                    MR. REYNOLDS: James Reynolds, 13920 South
         MR. LaROSE: And I did submit it. I was told
                                                          14
14
                                                               Racine, Riverdale, Illinois. I only have one
   it would be part of the package.
                                                          15
15
         MR. JACKSON: Sir, would you please approach
                                                          16
                                                               question.
16
                                                          17
                                                                      I would like to know how this company can be
17
   the podium.
         MR. LaROSE: Thank you. See you all in court.
                                                          1.8
                                                               operating. Are they operating on a permit that was
18
                                                               issued by the Village of Riverdale or are they
19
         MR. JACKSON: State your name for the record.
                                                          19
         MR. STEWART: Good evening. My name is Paul
                                                          20
                                                               operating on a temporary permit?
70
21 Stewart. I just want to say I have known
                                                          21
                                                                      Had they been given a permit to operate by
22 Mr. Bracken and his team and have worked closely
                                                          22
                                                               the Village of Riverdale?
                                                                    MR. WELCH: As I stated before, the Village
   withh them over the years throughout the City of
                                                          23
23
                                                               authorized them to continue to operate while the
24 Chicago and State of Illinois.
                                                          24
                                                                                                           Page 13
                                                Page 12
                                                               they would be subject to be shut down.
   zoning application was being processed.
 2
         MR. REYNOLDS: How can that be? Say, for
                                                           2
                                                                    MR. REYNOLDS: Do they have a permit?
    instance, I want to start a business, and I just
                                                                    MR. WELCH: They were authorized.
                                                           3
   say, well, I'm just going to start operating until
                                                                    MR. REYNOLDS: Do they have a permit?
                                                                    MR. WELCH: They were not issued a paper
    you make a decision to give me a permit. How did
                                                           5
    that come about? That's all I want to know.
                                                           6
                                                               permit, no.
         MR. WELCH: As I stated in the hearing --
                                                            7
                                                                    MR. REYNOLDS: Thank you. That is all I wanted
         MR. REYNOLDS: It was not stated in the
                                                               to know.
 8
                                                           8
 9
    hearing.
                                                           9
                                                                    MR. JACKSON: Mr. Marzano.
                                                                    MR. MARZANO: Joseph Marzano, 458 West 136th
10
         MR. WELCH: The Village originally deemed them
                                                               Place. I haven't been to a lot of meetings lately,
11 a contractor yard. On further review, it was deemed
                                                          11
                                                               but every time I come, people want to speak
12
   that a contractor yard was not the correct
                                                          12
                                                               negatively.
13
   determination.
                                                                        I do want to thank the Board. So the
14
         MR. REYNOLDS: But they stated --
                                                          14
15
         MR, WELCH: I'm answering the question. On
                                                          15
                                                               residents know, right before Thanksgiving the Board
   further review it was deemed that the contractor's
                                                               and the Mayor were able to hand out 370 food boxes
                                                          17
                                                               to residents. These are families that wouldn't have
    yard was not the correct use determination.
17
                                                               a Thanksgiving dinner if it weren't for the Mayor
           So they had already started operating when
                                                          18
18
    they were deemed the contractor's yard. So we then
                                                          19
                                                               asking for donations for food.
    brought them in and informed them that the proper
                                                          20
                                                                       My second thing is I've lived in Riverdale
20
                                                               for a long time and all the land on 138th has been
21 use should be a metal recycling transfer station.
                                                          21
```

22

23

empty since I was a kid.

I don't see the problem with people wanting

to come into Riverdale, spend their own money

22 And they agreed to submit to the conditional use

23 permit process, and they understood that in the

event this conditional use was not granted, that

24

\$	7:00	Appeals 5:6	business 4:22 11:1,7 12:3 14:20
J	- 4.4		4.22 11.1,7 12.5 14.20
\$50,000	A	— application 7:24 12:1	С
7:12	-	appreciate	S
	ability	11:11	call
1	8:2	approach	4:2,8 6:7
1201	able	10:16	can't
5:1	13:16	asked	11:1
	accept	14:23	case
136th 13:10	8:16	asking	7:13
	action	8:20 13:19 14:5	Cassandra
138th	9:16 10:1		4:11
5:2 13:21	actions	assistant 7:15	causes
13920	9:4		8:4
11:14	additional	attorney	CD
18	8:2	5:10 7:23 9:3	7:12
7:14		authorized	Chair
	address 7:1 10:9	11:24 13:3	7:3
2		aware	
	addressed	7:23	chance
20	11:5		6:5
7:9	adjourn	В	Chicago
2017	15:9		10:24
4:5	adjourned	based	Chief
28	15:13	11:9	5:5
4:5	administrative	benefit	Circuit
2:00	10:2	7:12	9:5,18,23
6:3 7:16	adopt	better	citizen
0.07.10	5:7,11	11:1	10:11
3		Board	City
	agenda 5:19	4:3 5:6 7:1,6 8:22,24 9:1,	City 10:23
3		4,24 10:1,9,13 13:14,15	
4:21	agreed	14:5,11	cleaned 14:19
370	12:22	Bosco	
13:16	Alexander	7:7	closed
.5.10	7:16	boxes	7:21 8:8 9:24
4	allegiance	13:16	closely
4	4:8		10:22
458	allow	Bracken 10:22	color
13:10	4:23 14:19		15:2
	allowed	bring	come
7	7:2	14:7	11:2 12:6 13:12,24 14:1
•	= answer	bringing	15:7
7:23	15:6	14:1,3	coming
15:13		brought	11:7
	answering 12:15	12:20	
	12.10		1

comment		establishes	give
5:18,21 6:1,5	D	5:6	12:5
comments 5:17 11:12 14:9 15:9	damage	evening	given
	15:3	4:2 10:20 14:11	11:21
community	date	event	God
11:2,7 15:2	4:4	9:16 12:24	14:13,16 15:5
companies 11:8	de	evidence 8:3,7	goes 7:13
company 11:10,17 15:5	9:10,12,16 decision 12:5	Excuse 5:14	going 5:16 7:9 9:18 10:12 12:4 14:5,7,13
concerns	decision	10:5,8	good
11:3,5	9:8		4:2 10:20 14:11 15:14
6:1	deemed 12:10,11,16,19	explain 9:10	granted 12:24
conditional	delivered	11:6	granting
4:23 12:22,24	6:2 7:15		4:23
conditions 5:7 considered	determination 12:13,17	F	н
9:15	dinner	facility	Half
contaminated	13:18	4:24	
14:17,18	discussed	fact	10:6
	5:4	14:17	hand
continue	discussion	families	13:16
11:24	8:1	13:17	haven't
contractor	Disposal	favor	13:11
12:11,12	7:8	15:11	heard
contractor's	district	firm 7:7	11:5
12:16,19	5:1		hearing
controlled	document	FOIA 8:13	5:4,23 7:20,21,22 8:10,
9:1	6:2		11,12,14,19 9:7 12:7,9
Cook	documentation	folks	heart
9:5 11:9	8:7	7:8	14:15
12:12,17	dollars 7:11 14:8	food 13:16,19	history 7:14
County 9:6 11:9	don't	forth	HOLCOMB
	8:17 13:23 14:21	5:8	4:9,11,13,15,17,19 6:8,
court 8:18 9:5,18,24 10:18	donations	further 12:11,16	12,14,16,18,20,22
create 9:18	E	- G	l'm
created 9:23	empty	general	12:4,15 14:5
creating 9:22	13:22	5:1	13:20

I-2 5:1	jobs 14:2,7	Linda 7:16	motion 5:10 6:24 15:9
Illinois	Joseph	little	moved 5:12 15:10
10:24 11:15	13:10	14:24	5:12 15:10
impossible	justice	lived	
8:10,12	14:16	13:20	N N
impressive	3	long	V=
11:9	K	13:21	name
income		look	7:4,6 10:19,20
14:1	keep	15:1	negatively
	14:6		13:13
Incorrect	kid	lot	never
10:4	13:22	13:11	14:19
industrial			
5:1	know	M	new 4:22 8:15 9:13 11:7
informed	9:4 11:2,17 12:6 13:8,15 14:15,21 15:4,5		
12:20		Mark	night
	known	7:6	15:14
injustice 14:13	5:1 10:21	Marzano	November
		13:9,10	4:5
instance	L	Mayor	novo
12:3		5:14 7:5 13:16,18	9:10,12,16
integrity	land		0.10,12,10
14:21,24 15:4	13:21 14:1,16	me	
interaction	Larose	10:7	0
11:10	5:14,16,20 6:2 7:4,5,7,22	means	
	8:9,20 9:3,13,19,21 10:1,	9:13	o'clock
interest	6,14,18	meditation	4:4 6:3 7:16
7:24	lately	4:6	offering
issued	13:11		14:2
11:19 13:5		meeting 4:3 7:22 15:13	Officers
issues	Latin		7:6
9:17	9:13	meetings	
	law	11:4 13:11	Okay 10:1
it's	7:7 9:14 10:3	members	
4:4 6:3 8:7,19 10:12 14:7	lawsuit	5:6 6:24 7:6	once
Item	14:18	metal	7:2
4:21		4:24 12:21	operate
	lawyer 10:7		11:21,24
J		million	operating
	legislative	7:11	7:14 11:18,20 12:4,18
JACKSON	9:15	minority	
4:2,21 5:9,15 6:7,24	Levere	11:8	opportunity
10:5,8,16,19 11:12 13:9	4:17,18 6:22,23	minutes	7:1 8:6
14:9 15:8,11,13	Lewis	7:2	order
James	4:13,14 6:6,8,9,11,12,13		4:3 5:15
11:14	15:12	moment	ordinance
		4:5	4:22 5:3,8,21 7:18
Jefferson	light	money	
4:9,10 5:13 6:16,17	11:6	13:24 14:23	

originally 12:10	pledge 4:8	questions 5:9 11:3	results 8:13
outside 6:3	podium 10:17	quorum 4:21	review 9:5,11,12,16 10:2,3
Р	politics 14:4	R	12:11,16 reviewed 5:24
p.m.	poor 15:1	Racine	Reynolds
15:13 package	positive	11:15 raised	11:13,14 12:2,8,14 13:2, 4,7
7:16 10:15	11:6 posted	11:4	right
paper 13:5	7:12	recognized 7:3	9:20 13:15 rights
part	pray 14:13 15:5	recommendation 5:7	8:5
7:19 8:20 9:21 10:12,15 participation	prayer 15:6	record	Riley-pinkney 4:11 6:18,19
11:8 parties	praying 14:12	5:4,22,24 6:3 7:4,20 8:7, 18,21 9:2,18,22,24 10:13,19	Riverdale 4:23 7:13 11:15,19,22
7:24 pass	present 4:21	recycling	13:20,24 14:2,8,12,14,23 Roll
5:21	principal	4:24 12:21 redeveloping	4:8 6:7
passed 6:24 7:18 14:6	7:7	14:1	7:11
Paul 10:20	prior 11:4	reflection 4:6	ruling 8:17,23
people 13:12,23 14:3,22 15:2,3	problem 13:23	refute 8:3	run 7:9
people's 8:4	problems 8:4	regard 15:5	s
perfect	process 12:23	regular 4:3	Scharnhorst
7:14 permit	processed	relates 8:4	5:5
11:18,20,21 12:5,23 13:2,4,6	proper	represent	9:14
person 11:1	12:20 proposing	7:8 request	second 5:13 6:6 13:20 15:12
pick	8:3 provided	8:13	see 10:18 13:23
7:10 14:5 PINKNEY	5:5,22	resident 10:10	serve
4:12	public 5:16,18,24 6:5 7:1	residents 13:15,17	14:22 set
Place 13:11		respect	5:8
please 4:7 5:10 6:4,7 7:3 10:16	Q	7:17 Respectfully	Shipp 14:10,11
4.7 9.10 0.4,7 7.3 10.10	question 11:16 12:15	9:9	shut

13:1	support	Today's	We'll
sir	14:6	4:4	4:5
5:15,22 10:16	supporting	told	we're
sit	14:7	10:14	9:18 15:3
6:4	sworn	town	Welch
	14:22	7:9 15:1,6	5:2,3,12,18,22 6:4,10
site		transcript	7:21 8:9,19,22 9:3,9,15,
7:13		8:11	20,23 10:4,10 11:23
Smith			12:7,10,15 13:3,5
4:19,20 6:14,15	take	transfer	weren't
somebody	5:16 9:17	4:24 7:9,17 12:21	13:18
10:7		trash	West
	taken	7:10	5:2 13:10
South 11:14	10:6	Tri-state	
11:14	tax	7:8	Williams
speak	14:7		4:15,16 6:20,21 15:10
7:2 13:12	team	Trustee	wish
spend	10:22	4:9,13,15,17,19 6:8,12,	10:9
13:24		14,16,18,20,22	withh
atand	tell	Trustees	10:23
stand 4:7	10:7	4:3	
	tells		worked
start	14:16	U	10:22
12:3,4	temporary	:	worthless
started	11:20	understand	5:20
12:18		9:12	wouldn't
state	thank	understood	13:17
7:3 10:19,24	7:5 10:18 11:12 13:7,14 14:9	12:23	
			wrong
stated	Thanksgiving	unlawfulness	7:13 9:9
5:23 11:23 12:7,8,14	13:15,18	15:6	
station	there's	use	Υ
4:24 7:9,17 12:21	14:15	4:23 12:17,21,22,24	-
Stewart	they're		yard
10:20,21	14:5	V	12:11,12,17,19
			year
stop	thing	Village	7:14
14:3	13:20	4:22 5:10 7:11 11:19,22,	years
Street	things	23 12:10 14:2,17	7:10 10:23 11:10
5:2	8:14		
stuff	think	W	You'll
8:15	8:16 14:3		6:4 7:2
subject		want	you're
5:7 9:5,10,16 10:2 13:1	three 7:2	8:17 9:17 10:21 12:3,6	5:15,16 7:3 8:3 9:9
		13:12,14 14:11	
submit	time		Z
8:1,2,3,6,10,13 10:10,11,	10:5,8 11:11 13:12,21	wanted	
14 12:22	today	11:6 13:7	zoning
Supply	6:3 7:15 9:4	wanting	5:6 8:24 9:1,24 10:1,12
7:10		13:23	12:1

EXHIBIT JJ

Special meetings may be called by the president of the village or any three trustees upon at least twenty-four hours' notice to all members and the president. If all the trustees are present at a special meeting, no notice of the meeting shall be necessary and such notice shall be deemed waived.

2.08.050 Presiding officer.

The village president shall be the presiding officer of all regular and special meetings of the board of trustees and at all times when the board meets as a committee of the whole.

2.08.060 Quorum.

A majority of the trustees, or three trustees and the village president, shall constitute a quorum to do business.

2.08.070 Ordinances, resolutions and motions – Approval or veto by village president.

All resolutions and motions (A) which create any liability against the village or (B) which provide for the expenditure or appropriation of its money, or (C) to sell any village property, and all ordinances passed by the village board shall be deposited with the village clerk. If the village president approves of them, he shall sign them. Those of which he disapproves, he shall return to the village board, with his written objections, at the next regular meeting of the village board occurring not less than five days after their passage. The village president may disapprove of any one or more sums appropriated in any ordinance, resolution or motion making an appropriation, and if so, the remainder shall be effective. However, the village president may disapprove entirely of an ordinance, resolution or motion making an appropriation. If the village president fails to return any ordinance or any specified resolution with his written objections, within the designated time, it shall become effective despite the absence of his signature.

2.08.080 Reconsideration - Passing over veto.

Every resolution and motion specified in RMC 2.08.070, and every ordinance, which is returned to the board of trustees by the village president, shall be reconsidered by the board of trustees. If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of all the trustees elected to the village board agree to pass an ordinance, resolution or motion, notwithstanding the president's refusal to approve it, then it shall be effective. The vote on the question of passage over the president's veto shall be by yeas and nays, and shall be recorded in the journal.

EXHIBIT KK

(65 ILCS 5/Art. 6 Div. 4 heading) DIVISION 4. FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF MAYOR, COUNCIL AND OFFICERS

(65 ILCS 5/6-4-1) (from Ch. 24, par. 6-4-1) Sec. 6-4-1. Mayor.

The mayor shall be recognized as the official head of the city or village by the courts for the purpose of serving civil process and by the governor for all legal purposes.

The mayor of any city or village which adopts this Article 6 shall have veto power as provided in Sections 6-4-2 through 6-4-4 and ordinances or measures may be passed over his veto as therein provided. Such mayor shall have the power to vote as provided in Section 6-4-5.

If any other act or any article of this Code other than Article 3 or Article 4 provides for the appointment of a board, commission or other agency by the mayor and the corporate authorities establish such board, commission or agency, such appointments shall be made in manner so provided. (Source: P.A. 76-746.)

(65 ILCS 5/6-4-2) (from Ch. 24, par. 6-4-2) Sec. 6-4-2. Ordinances - Approval - Veto.

All ordinances passed by the council shall be deposited with the city or village clerk. If the mayor approves of them, he shall sign them. Those of which he disapproves he shall return to the council, with his written objections, at the next regular meeting of the council occurring not less than 5 days after their passage. The mayor may disapprove of any one or more sums appropriated in any ordinance, resolution, or motion making an appropriation, and, if so, the remainder shall be effective. However, the mayor may disapprove entirely of an ordinance, resolution, or motion making an appropriation. If the mayor fails to return any ordinance or any specified resolution or motion with his written objections, within the designated time, it shall become effective despite the absence of his signature. The vote on every ordinance shall be by yeas and nays, and shall be recorded in the journal.

(Source: P.A. 76-746.)

EXHIBIT LL

MARK A. LAROSE *
JOSEPH A. BOSCO *
DAVID KOPPELMAN
DAVID ROSEMEYER
DAVID J. ARON
COSTA DIAMOND
MARISSA R. ALASKA
NATALIE MARTELLO



200 N. LASALLE STREET SUITE 2810 CHICAGO, IL 60601 P: (312) 642-4414 F: (312) 642-0434

135 S. WHITTAKER
NEW BUFFALO, MI 49117
P: (269) 469-8440
F: (269) 469-8442

OF COUNSEL
HON. ANTHONY J. BOSCO (1928-2008)
JOSEPH G. ALIOTO **
ALBERTO QUIROS JAEN***

* ADMITTED IN MICHIGAN ALSO

** ADMITTED IN WISCONSIN ONLY

*** ADMITTED IN PANAMA ONLY

February 10, 2020

NOTICE TO CEASE AND DESIST

By E-Mail: mjs@dalevgeorges.com
Riverdale Materials, LLC
c/o Mr. Michael Synowiecki
Registered Agent
Daley and Georges
20 S. Clark Street, Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60603

Dear Mr. Synowiecki,

I represent the owners of the retention pond adjacent to Riverdale Materials' facility in Riverdale, Illinois.

During the proceedings to obtain the Village's authorization for Riverdale Materials to conduct business within the Village, representatives of Riverdale Materials testified that stormwater runoff and drainage for its facility would be pursuant to an "on-site retention pond." That was neither true nor accurate. Neither Riverdale Materials nor any entity affiliated with it owns the retention pond. My client does.

Riverdale Materials is hereby put on **notice to cease and desist** from any drainage, stormwater runoff, or any other depositing of materials into my client's retention pond now and in the future. Stormwater runoff from Riverdale Materials' facility and any other water collected at Riverdale Materials' facility needs to be managed on Riverdale Materials' property, and not on my client's property.

We look forward to Riverdale Materials' response to this cease and desist notice, and cooperation. Continued use of my client's retention pond in order to manage its stormwater or other runoff of its facility will not be tolerated, and my client is prepared to take legal action to prevent the same.

Riverdale Materials, LLC February 10, 2020 Page 2

In the meantime, if you have any questions or are in need of additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Mark A. LaRose

MAL/mk

EXHIBIT MM

DECLARATION UNDER OATH OF SHERYL GERMANY

- I, Sheryl Germany, being duly sworn on oath and under penalty of perjury, do hereby state as follows:
 - 1. I am the President of Tri-State Disposal, Inc.
- 2. The facts contained in this Declaration are based on my personal knowledge, and if called to do so, I could competently testify to these facts.
- 3. To protect the retention pond adjacent to the Riverdale Materials' site from further contamination and to establish that Riverdale Materials did not have ownership or the ability to use the retention pond for stormwater run-off, in May 2019, Tri-State (as managing member of an affiliated company, North Side 138, LLC) purchased the retention pond. At my direction, our attorney issued a Cease and Desist Notice to Riverdale Materials to stop using the retention pond for its runoff from its contaminated site. Riverdale Materials never responded to that letter.

Further Declarant Sayeth Not.

Sheryl Germany

EXHIBIT NN

DECLARATION UNDER OATH OF MARK A. LAROSE

- I, Mark A. LaRose, being duly sworn on oath and under penalty of perjury, do hereby state as follows:
 - 1. I am the attorney for Tri-State Disposal in this case.
- 2. The facts contained in this Declaration are based on my personal knowledge, and if called to do so, I could competently testify to these facts.
- 3. On February 10, 2020, Jim Bracken called me, at night, at home, on my cell phone, and threatened me and my client. I told him I was sleeping, give me a second to get out of bed, and he said 'No, I'm not going to give you any time to record this phone call," at which time he proceeded to threaten me and my client repeatedly.
- 4. On February 12, 2020, I sent a letter to Mr. Bracken's lawyers, Daley and Georges, telling them to advise Mr. Bracken to refrain from ever contacting me again.
 - 5. I never received even the courtesy of a response to my letter.
- 6. Based on a response to a FOIA sent to the Village requesting all documents, information, submittals, approvals, and/or actions pertaining to a stormwater pollution prevention plan and dust control plan, there were no responsive documents to show that anything was reviewed by a Village engineer as required by Village Ordinance 2017-22.

Further Declarant Sayeth Not.

Mark A. LaRose

EXHIBIT OO

MARK A. LAROSE *
JOSEPH A. BOSCO *
DAVID KOPPELMAN
DAVID ROSEMEYER
DAVID J. ARON
COSTA DIAMOND
MARISSA R. ALASKA
NATALIE MARTELLO



200 N. LASALLE STREET SUITE 2810 CHICAGO, IL 60601 P: (312) 642-4414 F: (312) 642-0434

135 S. WHITTAKER NEW BUFFALO, MI 49117 P: (269) 469-8440 F: (269) 469-8442

OF COUNSEL

HON. ANTHONY J. BOSCO (1928-2008) JOSEPH G. ALIOTO ** ALBERTO QUIROS JAEN***

- * ADMITTED IN MICHIGAN ALSO
- ** ADMITTED IN WISCONSIN ONLY
- *** ADMITTED IN PANAMA ONLY

February 12, 2020

By E-Mail: mis@daleygeorges.com

Riverdale Materials, LLC c/o Mr. Michael Synowiecki Registered Agent Daley and Georges 20 S. Clark Street, Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60603

Dear Michael,

I presume Daley and Georges still represents Riverdale Materials and Jim Bracken.

On Monday night, February 10, 2020, at 9:45 EST (while I was sleeping), my phone rang repeatedly until my wife finally got frustrated and answered it. It was Jim Bracken. I told him I was sleeping, give me a second to get out of bed, and he said "No, I'm not going to give you any time to record this phone call." He then proceeded to threaten me and my client repeatedly.

If you still represent Mr. Bracken and his companies, I would appreciate it if you would advise him not to ever contact me again.

Lawsuits are often a battle, but in the words of the late great Honorable Abraham Lincoln Marovitz, let us ". . . learn how to disagree without being disagreeable." Late night personal threats to me at my home on my private phone could never be construed as anything but absolutely inappropriate.

Very truly yours,

Marko

MAL/mk

cc: Joseph Bosco (jbosco@laroseboscolaw.com)

Michael Daley (mdaley@daleygeorges.com)

Mara Georges (mgeorges@daleygeorges.com)

EXHIBIT PP

1989 WL 20831 Only the Westlaw citation is currently available. United States District Court, N.D. Illinois, Eastern Division.

Brenda WEEKS, Plaintiff,

V.

CITY OF PLANO, Dennis Harris, Harry Haggard, Steve Eaves, Plano Police Department, and Others not presently known to Plaintiff, Defendants.

> No. 88 C 0518. March 7, 1989.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

PLUNKETT, District Judge.

*1 Plaintiff Brenda Weeks brings suit against the City of Plano, Illinois, the Plano Police Department, Chief of Police Dennis Harris, Officers Harry Haggard and Steve Eaves, and others not presently known to Plaintiff. In a Memorandum Opinion and Order dated August 9, 1988, we granted Defendants' motion to dismiss Plaintiff's original complaint. Plaintiff subsequently filed an amended complaint. Currently before us is the City of Plano's motion to dismiss the amended complaint in so far as it pertains to the City. For the reasons set forth below, the motion is denied. The City's motion to strike the portions of the amended complaint seeking punitive damages against the City, is, however, granted.

Our prior opinion set forth the allegations of the original complaint in detail. Because the substance of those allegations remains substantially unchanged, we shall proceed directly to a discussion of the issues presently before us.

Discussion

The City asserts that Plaintiff's Section 1983 claim against it cannot stand because Plaintiff has not pleaded a policy or custom on the part of the City sufficient to hold the City liable under Section 1983. The allegations of the amended complaint relevant to the City's potential liability are twofold. Plaintiff alleges that the campaign of harassment was planned by, among others, Chief of Police Harris. (Amended Complaint, Para. 13) She also alleges that the Mayor of Plano met with Defendants Harris and Haggard prior to Plaintiff's termination, knew of the individual Defendants' actions, and sanctioned those actions. (*Id.* at Para. 25)

The City contends that only the Plano City Council has authority to make policy concerning police conduct. It asserts that any departures from the "Rules and Regulations of the Plano Police Department" passed by the City Council on February 14, 1983 constitute individual action which cannot be attributed to the City for purposes of assigning liability under Section 1983. As we shall explain below, we disagree.

Our decision is guided by the Supreme Court's plurality opinions in *Pembaur v. Cincinnati*, 475 U.S. 469 (1986) and *St. Louis v. Praprotnik*, 108 S.Ct. 915 (1988). In *Pembaur*, the Court ¹ made clear that municipal liability may be imposed for a single decision by a municipal policy-maker in appropriate circumstances:

To be sure, "official policy" often refers to formal rules or understandings—often but not always committed to writing —that are intended to, and do, establish fixed plans of action to be followed under similar circumstances and over time.... However, ... a government frequently chooses a course of action tailored to a particular situation and not intended to control decisions in later situations. If the decision to adopt that particular course of action is properly made by that government's authorized decision-makers, it surely represents an act of official government "policy" as that term is commonly understood. More importantly, where action is directed by those who establish governmental policy, the municipality is equally responsible whether that action is to be taken only once or to be taken repeatedly.

*2 475 U.S. at 480–81. In *Praprotnik*, the plurality acknowledged that in some cases policy-making responsibility is shared among more than one official or body. 108 S.Ct. at 925. It went on to emphasize that

the authority to make municipal policy is necessarily the authority to make *final* policy. When an official's discretionary decisions are constrained by policies not of that official's making, those policies, rather than the subordinate's

departures from them, are the act of the municipality. Similarly, when a subordinate's decision is subject to review by the municipality's authorized policymakers, they have retained the authority to measure the official's conduct for conformance with *their* policies. If the authorized policymakers approve a subordinate's decision and the basis for it, their ratification would be chargeable to the municipality because their decision is final.

Id. at 926 (citation omitted).

Pembaur makes clear that a decision not intended for general application, but rather tailored to a particular case, is properly attributable to a municipality if made by the municipality's authorized policymakers. Moreover, *Praprotnik* indicates that ratification of a non-policymaker's decision (and the basis for it) by an authorized policymaker is also sufficient to subject a municipality to liability under Section 1983. Here, Plaintiff has alleged that unconstitutional actions were planned by the Chief of Police and approved by the Mayor. If one or both of these officials are "authorized policymakers," the unconstitutional actions are properly charged to the municipality itself. Thus, the City's potential liability turns on whether the Chief of Police and/or the Mayor are "authorized policymakers."

The identification of policymaking officials is a question of state law, which includes valid local ordinances and regulations. *St. Louis*, 108 S.Ct. at 924. Illinois law provides that the powers and duties of a Mayor are, *inter alia*, "to exercise control of all departments and divisions ... created in this Article ... or that may be created by the council." Ill.Rev.Stat. Ch. 24, Para. 6–4–7. As to the duties of the Chief of Police, the police department rules passed by the Plano City Council provide that "[t]he Chief of Police is the chief executive officer of the Department and the final departmental authority on all matters of policy, operations, and discipline...." (Ch. II, I–A)

We believe that both the Chief of Police, as the "final departmental authority on all matters of policy," and the Mayor, who is empowered to exercise control over all of the municipality's departments, including the police department, are authorized policymakers as to police department operations under state and local law. Thus, the actions of these officials "'are, properly speaking, acts 'of the municipality.'" *Pembaur*, 475 U.S. at 480; see also Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658 (1978). The motion to dismiss Plaintiff's Section 1983 claim against the City is therefore denied.

*3 The City also moves to strike Plaintiff's requests for punitive damages against the City under both Section 1983 and state law. In that respect, Defendant's motion is granted. Municipalities are not subject to punitive damages under Section 1983. Newport v. Fact Concerts, Inc., 453 U.S. 247 (1981). Punitive damages against a municipality are similarly unavailable under state law. III.Rev.Stat. Ch. 85, Section 2–102. Thus, Plaintiff's requests for punitive damages against the City and against the individual Defendants in their respective official capacities are stricken. See Monell, 436 U.S. at 690, n. 55 (suit against public employee in her official capacity tantamount to suit against the municipality itself).

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the motion of the City of Plano to dismiss the complaint against the City is denied, but the amended complaint is stricken in so far as it seeks punitive damages against the City or against individual city employees in their official capacities.

All Citations

Not Reported in F.Supp., 1989 WL 20831

Footnotes

The portion of *Pembaur* to be quoted represents the opinion of the Court rather than a mere plurality.